

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 15, 20, and 23 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-6, 20, and 23, and has canceled claims 2, 3, 10-14, 16, 17, and 19 (claims 7-9, 18, 21, 22, 24, and 25 were previously canceled). The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to specify that the printing apparatus includes a correcting module, a log recording module, and a calculating module. Applicant has amended independent claim 20, which defines a control method that controls a printing apparatus, and independent claim 23, which defines a computer-readable storage medium in which a computer program for controlling a printing apparatus is stored, along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended. Support for the changes made to claims 1, 20, and 23 may be found in the specification at, for example, Paragraphs [0080]-[0088].

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Suzuki et al.* ("Suzuki") (US 2002/0065940 A1) in view of *Sekizawa* (US 6,604,212 B2) and *Hattori et al.* (US 6,570,667 B1). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of the *Suzuki*, *Sekizawa*, and *Hattori* references does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in independent claim 20, as amended herein.

None of the *Suzuki*, *Sekizawa*, and *Hattori* references discloses or suggests the features that have been added to present claim 20. Thus, even if the *Suzuki*, *Sekizawa*, and *Hattori* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the combination would not have resulted in a control method that controls a printing apparatus including each and every feature of present claim 20. As such, the combination of *Suzuki* in

view of *Sekizawa* and *Hattori* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in present claim 20.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 20, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Suzuki* in view of *Sekizawa* and *Hattori*.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory et al.* (“*Mallory*”) (US 2002/0006136 A1) and *Hattori* (as noted above, claims 2 and 3 have been canceled). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory* and *Hattori* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness the subject matter defined in independent claim 1, as amended herein.

None of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Hattori* references discloses or suggests the features that have been added to present claim 1. Thus, even if the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Hattori* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the combination would not have resulted in a printing apparatus including each and every feature of present claim 1. As such, the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory* and *Hattori* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in present claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory* and *Hattori*. Claims 5 and 6, each of which depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory* and *Hattori* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, *Hattori*, and known

prior art. Claim 4 depends from claim 1. The known prior art cited by the Examiner does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Hattori* references relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, *Hattori*, and known prior art for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 10-17, 19, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, *Hattori*, and *Suzuki* (as noted above, claims 10-14, 16, 17, and 19 have been canceled). Claim 15 depends from claim 1. The *Suzuki* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, and *Hattori* references relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, *Hattori*, and *Suzuki* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

Turning to independent claims 20 and 23, claim 20 is a method claim that corresponds to present claim 1, and claim 23 is a computer-readable storage medium claim that corresponds to present claim 1. As noted above, Applicant has amended claims 20 and 23 along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended. Thus, for at least the same reasons discussed above, the result of the combination of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, *Hattori*, and *Suzuki* references would not have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claims 20 and 23. As such, the combination of the *Sekizawa*, *Mallory*, *Hattori*, and *Suzuki* references does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in present claims 20 and 23.

Accordingly, independent claims 20 and 23, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Sekizawa* in view of *Mallory*, *Hattori*, and *Suzuki*.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 4-6, 15, 20, and 23, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP068).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920